

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 759

HE 033 603

AUTHOR Pitter, Gita Wijesinghe
TITLE New Offerings for a New Era: Evaluating the Viability of New Degree Programs.
PUB DATE 2000-00-00
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Higher Education; Program Content; Program Evaluation; *Program Proposals; *Program Validation; Standards
IDENTIFIERS State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the methodology developed by the State University System of Florida (SUS) to propose new programs and evaluate their viability prior to approval. Universities must initially request that programs for development be placed on the 5-year strategic plan. Once on the SUS strategic plan, universities may submit proposals following a prescribed format that includes: program description; institutional mission; planning process and timetable; assessment of need and demand; curriculum; institutional capability; assessment of impact on programs currently offered; community college articulation; assessment of applicable accreditation standards; and productivity. A review format consisting of 25 criteria (and standards for each criteria) is used. Once a proposal is submitted, Board action on new degree proposals consists of one of the following: no action, no action with an invitation to resubmit, planning authorization, and implementation authorization. Universities must demonstrate through the proposals that sufficient resources have been committed to the program to ensure its quality. A new system to follow up on programs through the program review process is being developed. Appended are: the new degree proposal format; criteria and standards for evaluating new degree proposals; and a sample chart of ratings on the 25 criteria. (Contains 10 references.) (SM)

HE

ED 447 759

New Offerings for a New Era: Evaluating the Viability of New Degree Programs

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

G. W. Pitter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Gita Wijesinghe Pitter
Director, Program Authorization
State University System of Florida

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE033008

.. 2

New Offerings for a New Era: Evaluating the Viability of New Degree Programs

Abstract

As institutions of higher education attempt to position themselves for a new era, attention is inevitably drawn to the offering of new academic programs to meet the needs of the future. It is important for colleges and universities to institute procedures and develop tools for assessing the potential for success of proposed new ventures before they are launched, usually at considerable expense. The proposed paper will present the methodology developed by the governing body of a large state university system to propose new programs and evaluate their viability prior to approval.

¹New Offerings for a New Era: Evaluating the Viability of New Degree Programs

Introduction

As institutions of higher education attempt to position themselves for a new era, attention is inevitably drawn to the offering of new academic programs to meet the needs of the future. It is important for colleges and universities to institute procedures and develop tools for assessing the potential for success of proposed new ventures before they are launched, usually at considerable expense and with rising expectations among students and other constituents. This paper presents the methodology developed by the Florida Board of Regents (BOR) to propose new programs and evaluate their viability prior to approval. This methodology has proven effective and has been improved upon in the past year.

Initiating new programs is one of the most fundamental ways in which a university reshapes itself. It is critical that new programs be designed as part of an overarching vision that supports the mission of the university. As universities transform themselves in response to advances in knowledge and in anticipation of changes in the marketplace, it is important that new degree programs be nurtured in a climate of innovation. The role of the central administration is critical in providing a vision, making wise choices, overcoming territorialism and seeking new opportunities. These opportunities and the impetus for new programs may come from many

¹The views expressed in this paper are those of the author, and not necessarily those of the Florida Board of Regents.

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Krista Mooney in compiling information on program approval processes of university systems in other states.

sources. In the past, many new programs were initiated solely on the strength of faculty interest and aspirations (Seymore, 1988).

In an era of increased demands for accountability in higher education, initiating new programs primarily to satisfy faculty interests and aspirations is no longer justifiable. Today the *raison d'être* for new academic programs must be founded on factors such as national and local market need, student demand, new developments in disciplines or spurring economic development. Proposals must make a case along these lines for establishing new degree programs and evaluations of proposals should establish criteria which require convincing evidence of need and demand.

Demonstration of need alone, however, should not be sufficient for establishing a program. While faculty interest is not a sufficient condition for establishing new programs, it is a necessary one when a new program builds on existing departments. Initiating a new program takes faculty who are committed, productive, and qualified. A commitment of resources from the institution and the support of key administrators are also important ingredients.

Review of Literature

A study of program need conducted by Meyer for the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board in 1991 revealed that rationales for creating new programs generally fell into nine categories: growth, occupational production, professional certification or credentialing, economic development, student benefit, social amelioration, public interest, preferential need, and need for resources (Meyer, 1991). Some of these categories offer more compelling reasons than others for initiating new programs, and will be discussed in the context of evaluating proposals.

A review of documents from several selected university systems around the United States revealed that most require two steps in the process to initiate new degree programs. The first step involved a preliminary identification of the programs to be initiated. This phase was referred to in various ways, such as a letter of intent, a preproposal or a program development plan. Some systems, such as the Louisiana Board of Regents, required quite elaborate information at this initial phase including need, a description of the program, enrollment, resources, and costs. The Ohio Board of Regents, in addition to the above, also required any available consultant reports at this point. Once approval was granted at this planning stage, the institutions could submit full proposals for consideration. Higher education systems which had highly developed processes for new degree approval included program quality considerations as well as accountability considerations, while other systems had leaner processes focused on accountability issues such as need and cost.

Some common elements appearing in new degree documents of many systems as requirements for submission in the proposal were: Evidence of need for the proposed program, program duplication in relation to other institutions in the state, description of the program, projected student enrollment, and costs. Other elements required for inclusion in proposals in some systems were quality issues such as adequacy of faculty, library resources, facilities and equipment, site visits by external consultants, and discussion of special efforts to encourage diversity in the program. While most systems only inquired about the number of faculty involved in the proposed program, a few systems such as the University of Wisconsin System apparently attempted to assess the qualifications of the faculty as well, requesting abbreviated vitae. The State University System of Florida (SUS) likewise requests information on the

scholarly activity and specializations of the faculty in order to assess the faculty strengths to mount the program. Several systems, e.g. the Ohio Board of Regents, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Utah State Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin System and the Missouri Department of Higher Education, solicited comments from other institutions in the system when a proposal was received.

There appeared to be variation in the stringency of criteria proposals must meet in order to be approved. The Louisiana Board of Regents, for example, required that funding for a new program must fall within one of five categories: no new state funds, concomitant reductions through program terminations, the program will be funded through non-state funds for five years, program justification in terms of importance for economic development, or that the program was indispensable to the role and scope of the institution. A few systems, such as the Utah State System of Higher Education, appeared to provide processes for requesting additional funding for new degree programs but most, such as the Wisconsin System and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board expect that institutions will reallocate from their base in order to fund new degree programs. The latter is true of the Florida system as well.

Strategic Planning and New Degrees in the State University System of Florida

The State University System of Florida (SUS) requires that universities initially request that programs for development be placed on the five-year strategic plan. At this stage only minimal information on the program is sought. Reviews of existing programs have played a key role at this stage, providing information on the strength of current programs on which the new programs will be built, need for the program and issues of unwarranted duplication. As a large and growing system, the initial requests for placement on the Strategic plan number about 300

programs. Roughly 60% of these programs initially requested by the institutions are ultimately negotiated onto the SUS Strategic Plan. Based on previous history it is expected that about 70% of the programs on the strategic plan will eventually be implemented within the five-year life-span of the plan. Placement on the strategic plan therefore does not guarantee implementation; it simply authorizes the universities to consider initiating the programs and to provide full proposals to the BOR for doing so.

Inclusion in the five-year strategic plan is identified as the first step in the new degree approval process because long-range planning for new programs is considered to be critical for their success. In 1998, when the current five-year plan was adopted, the 10 universities in the system were classified into three categories: Comprehensive Universities, Research II Universities, and Research I Universities. The programs approved for placement on the strategic plan for each of the universities reflect their respective mission within the classification plan. As a system, the strategic plan enables the regents to set the long-range vision for the development of the institutions, and at an institutional level it provides lead time to involve the stakeholders in the planning process of new programs. Over the years it has become evident that planning for a proposal over a period of time, involving not only the program faculty but other key stakeholders such as faculty with related interests in other departments, the central administration and industry representatives, produce good proposals and ultimately programs with a strong likelihood of success.

Procedure for New Degree Approval

Once on the strategic plan for the SUS, universities may submit proposals following a prescribed format which includes the following sections:

- I. Program description. A general description including the level, areas of specialization and the number of hours.
- II. Institutional mission. A description of how the goals of the program relate to the institutional mission.
- III. Planning process and timetable. A description of the planning process including a chronology of activities and a timetable for program implementation.
- IV. Assessment of need and demand. Evidence of national, state and local need for the program, student demand for the program, anticipated enrollment in the program, and special efforts to ensure diversity of students.
- V. Curriculum. Listing of courses with brief descriptions, the sequence of courses, hours to the degree, and program prerequisites which at the bachelor's level should coincide with statewide common prerequisites.
- VI. Institutional capability. A discussion of the synergism of the program with already established institutional strengths, responses to previous program review and accreditation recommendations, faculty, library, facilities, equipment, scholarships and assistantships, internships, and other resources.
- VII. Assessment of Impact on Programs Currently Offered. Projected impact of program on existing programs through the diversion of funds to the new program or additional workload generated by the proposed program.
- VIII. Community College Articulation. As a two-plus-two system, community college articulation is central to the development of all baccalaureate level programs. Proposals must describe plans for articulation.

IX. Assessment of Applicable Accreditation Standards. Discussion of which accreditation agencies would be concerned with the program and plans for seeking accreditation.

X. Productivity. Presentation of evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with the new program have been productive in teaching, research and service.

A copy of the proposal format including elaboration of the above ten sections and accompanying tables for enrollment, faculty participation and costs is included in the appendices.

Proposals are reviewed by Board staff prior to placement on an agenda for consideration at a Board meeting. Spurred by the desire of regents to be more rigorous in considering new programs for implementation and their desire to be provided with more information before deciding on the approval of the programs, a review format consisting of 25 criteria were developed and approved in 1998, at the time the new strategic plan was developed. The 25 criteria have enabled staff to be more thorough and consistent in the review of proposals, train new staff more efficiently in reviewing new degree proposals, and provide Board members the information they desired.

A unique feature of the SUS new degree approval process is the extent to which not only the criteria but also the standards for meeting each of the criteria have been specified. Each criterion is rated by staff as falling into one of four categories: 1) not met; 2) met with weakness; 3) met; and 4) met with strength. This rating has provided staff with an extremely useful method of succinctly presenting, in the form of a chart, the evaluation of each proposal on the 25 criteria. Proposals which are not approved clearly exhibit that several criteria are "not met" or "met with weakness." The chart has given regents a level of information on the proposals that they did not previously have. It has also helped convince universities that some of their proposed programs

required more thought. A sample chart is included in the appendices. The chart, together with information from the staff analyses, now provide universities with explicit guidance regarding the problems in proposals which are not approved. One of the 25 criteria and accompanying standards appears below as an example.

➤ *The proposed program does not duplicate other SUS offerings or, otherwise, provides an adequate rationale for doing so.*

1. Not Met:

The program substantially duplicates other SUS programs without a convincing rationale for doing so.

2. Met with Weakness:

The program substantially duplicates other SUS programs, but there is a rationale for the duplication which, while not overwhelming, is convincing enough to warrant meeting the criterion.

3. Met:

- a. The proposed program will have a significantly different focus from other SUS programs in the same discipline, and / or
- b. The proposed program is expected of an institution of the size and mission as the one which submitted the proposal in terms of a full complement of degree offerings, and / or
- c. While there are similar SUS programs, they are in widely different geographic areas.
- d. The program is not offered anywhere else in the SUS.

4. Met with Strength:

The program is not offered anywhere else in the SUS and at least meets criterion five.

A select few of the remaining 25 criteria appear below. The entire set of 25 criteria, along with the standards for each, is included in the appendices.

➤*The proposal provides evidence that there is a need for more people to be educated in this program at this level.* This is one of the key criteria. No proposals that rate "not met" in this criteria are likely to receive Board authorization.

➤*The proposal provides an appropriate, sequenced, and described course of study.* The reasonableness of the curriculum in relation to the stated purpose of the program, other similar programs, time required to complete the program, and industry needs are among the considerations under this criterion.

➤*If there have been program reviews or accreditation activities in the disciplines pertinent to the proposed program, or in related disciplines, the proposal provides evidence that progress has been made in implementing the recommendations from these reviews.* This criterion helps ensure that new programs are built on existing strengths rather than on weak, poorly administered programs.

➤*The proposal provides evidence that there is a critical mass of faculty available to initiate the program based on estimated enrollments.* The standards for this criterion address not only the presence of faculty in the aggregate but also representation in the necessary specializations to offer the degree.

➤*For doctoral programs, the proposal provides evidence that the faculty in aggregate have the necessary experience and research activity to sustain the program.* Initiation of doctoral programs are given close scrutiny and usually involve a site visit by an external consultant and Board staff. The quality of the faculty, as well as other resources in the form of

facilities and equipment, play a key role in the decision to implement a program at this level.

➤ *The proposal provides evidence that classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office, and any other type of space which is necessary for the proposed program is sufficient to initiate the program.* Programs which require additional space are typically not approved for implementation until the new space is available. Therefore it is critical that institutions coordinate their facilities planning with planning for new degree programs. Similar criteria exist for library resources and equipment. Findings of program reviews and accreditation visits help determine if these criteria are met, in addition to information provided in the proposal. If additional resources are required in these categories, universities must demonstrate that those needs will be met.

Actions on New Degree Proposals

Once a proposal is submitted, Board action on new degree proposals consist of one of the following:

1. *No action.* Proposals which are seriously flawed in a fundamental sense, such as the conceptualization of the program or an obvious lack of need for the program, have no action taken on them. Such programs generally earn "not met" or "met with weakness" ratings on many criteria.
2. *No action, with an invitation to resubmit.* Proposals which are seriously flawed, with several criteria "not met" or "met with weakness", but which bear evidence of potential, are invited to submit a revised proposal at a later date.
3. *Planning authorization.* Proposals which are conceptually sound, demonstrate need and demand, but do not have the necessary resources in place are granted planning authorization.

Once the resources are in place the institution may submit a brief update to that effect and obtain Board authorization for implementation.

4. *Implementation authorization.* Proposals which earn "met" or "met with strength" ratings on almost all criteria, including a demonstration of need and the availability of all necessary resources including qualified faculty, are awarded implementation authorization.

New Degree Follow-up

The Florida legislature does not generally provide special funding to initiate new degree programs. Therefore universities in the SUS are expected to demonstrate through the proposals that sufficient resources have been committed to the program to ensure its quality. A new system to follow-up on new programs through the program review process is being developed. Universities will be requested to identify what resources have been provided to the new program, and what student enrollments have been realized, in comparison to the projections in the proposal. In this manner, the new degree approval process and the program review process form a cycle to provide for improvement of both existing and new programs.

Conclusion

The new degree approval process of the SUS provides a thorough examination of both accountability and quality concerns in mounting a program which serves students and society well. The tools employed, which help formalize the process, include 1) a new degree proposal format with ten specific categories and tables for projected enrollments, faculty participation and costs; 2) 25 criteria and standards for each of the criteria, enabling the assignment of ratings ranging from criterion "not met" to "met with strength;" 3) staff analyses based on the criterion;

and 4) a summary chart of the 25 criteria and ratings on each for all proposals submitted, which provides a succinct identification of the important considerations in visual form.

The process and tools developed for reviewing proposals may easily be utilized by other systems of higher education with similar interests. The tools may be adapted to meet specific areas of concern in other systems, by adding or deleting criteria or changing standards for specific criteria. The process and tools could also be adapted for individual institutions reviewing their own readiness to offer new degree programs. Criteria of consistency with mission of the institution, market need and student demand for the program, the strength of the program to offer the new degree, the strength of other units on campus which may contribute are all important considerations regardless of whether the program proposal is reviewed at a institutional or system level. At the institutional level, criteria regarding the availability of resources will be viewed from a different angle than at the system level. The institution will still need to assess what resources are necessary to mount a program of quality and then determine how those resources may be garnered. Placing all the various components in context and making a final decision on a new degree program is a complex task, and each program presents a unique set of circumstances. However, guiding principals suggested here may be utilized to make such decisions.

References

- Meyer, K.A. A Framework for Justifying Program Need. Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1991.
- Seymore, D. T. Developing Academic Programs. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 1988.
- Higher Education Coordinating Board, Washington. (1998). *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval and Review*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.heeb.wa.gov/eval/degreeprog.html> [2000, April 10].
- Louisiana Board of Regents. (1998, November). *Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures*, [Online]. Available: <http://webserv.regents.state.la.us/Academic/aahome.htm> [2000, April 21].
- Missouri Department of Higher Education. (1997, April 17). *Policies and Procedures for the Review of Academic Program Proposals: New Academic Programs, Off-Site Delivery of Existing Programs, and Program Changes*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.mocbhe.gov/acadafrs/progre.htm> [2000, April 21].
- Ohio Board of Regents. (1999, July 23). *Guidelines and Procedures for Review and Approval of Graduate Degree Programs*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.regents.state.oh.us/> [2000, April 10].
- University of Colorado Regent Policies. (1999, November 15). *Policy on Procedures for Approving New Degree Program Proposals*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/policies.html> [2000, April 21].
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (1999). *System Regulations: Approval Procedures for Degree Programs*, [Online]. Available: <http://sago.tamu.edu/policy> [2000, April 21].
- University of Wisconsin-Madison. *Process for the Approval of a New Academic Major or Degree*, [Online]. Available: <http://wiscinfo.doit.wisc.edu/obpa/acadprogchg.htm> [2000, April 21].
- Utah State System of Higher Education. *Policies and Procedures: Program Approval*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.utahsbr.edu/policy/r401.htm> [2000, April 21].

APPENDICES

14

17

Appendix A

New Degree Proposal Format

Attachment A

REQUEST TO OFFER A NEW DEGREE PROGRAM

University Submitting Proposal

Proposed Implementation Date

Name of Department(s)

Name of College or School

Complete Name of Degree

Academic Specialty or Field
(Include CIP Code)

The submission of this proposal constitutes a commitment by the university that, if the proposal is approved, the necessary financial commitment and the criteria for establishing new programs have been met prior to the initiation of the program.

Vice President for Academic Affairs

President

Date _____

Date _____

Indicate the dollar amounts appearing as totals for the first and the fifth years of implementation as shown in the appropriate summary columns in BOR Table Three. Provide headcount and FTE estimates of majors for years one through five. Headcount and FTE estimates should be identical to those in BOR Table One.

	<u>Total Estimated Costs</u>	<u>Projected Student HDCT / FTE</u>
First Year of Implementation	=====	___ / ___
Second Year of Implementation		___ / ___
Third Year of Implementation		___ / ___
Fourth Year of Implementation		___ / ___
Fifth Year of Implementation	=====	___ / ___

Note: This outline and the questions pertaining to each section must be reproduced within the body of the proposal in order to ensure that all sections have been satisfactorily addressed.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Describe the degree program under consideration, including its level, emphases (including tracks or specializations), and number of credit hours (total, and required for the major).

II. INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

Is the proposed program listed in the current State University System Strategic Plan? How do the goals of the proposed program relate to the institutional mission statement as contained in the Strategic Plan?

III. PLANNING PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

Describe the planning process leading up to submission of this proposal. Include a chronology of activities, listing the university personnel directly involved and any external individuals who participated in planning. Provide a timetable of events for the implementation of the proposed program.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF NEED AND DEMAND

- A. What national, state, or local data support the need for more people to be prepared in this program at this level? (This may include national, state, or local plans or reports that support the need for this program; demand for the proposed program which has emanated from a perceived need by agencies or industries in your service area; and summaries of prospective student inquiries.) Indicate potential employment options for graduates for the program. If similar programs exist in the state, provide data that support the need for an additional program.
- B. Use BOR Table One A (baccalaureate) or BOR Table One B (graduate) to indicate the number of students (headcount and FTE) you expect to major in the proposed program during each of the first five years of implementation, categorizing them according to their

primary sources. In the narrative following Table One, the rationale for enrollment projections should be provided and the estimated headcount to FTE ratio explained. If, initially, students within the institution are expected to change majors to enroll in the proposed program, describe the shifts from disciplines which will likely occur.

- C. For all programs, indicate what steps will be taken to achieve a diverse student body in this program. If the proposed program duplicates programs at FAMU or FIU, provide an analysis of how the program might impact those universities relative to their ability to attract students of races different from that which is predominant on their campuses. Please create a place for signature at the end of section (IV) (C) and have your university's Equal Opportunity officer read, sign, and date this section of the proposal.

V. CURRICULUM

- A. For all programs, provide a sequenced course of study and list the total number of credit hours for the degree. For bachelor's programs, also indicate the number of credit hours for the major coursework, the number of credit hours required as prerequisites to the major (if applicable), and the number of hours available for electives.
- B. For bachelor's programs, if the total number of credit hours exceeds 120, provide a justification for an exception to the SUS policy of a 120 maximum.
- C. Provide a one or two sentence description of each required or elective course.
- D. For bachelor's programs, list any prerequisites, and provide assurance that they are the same as the standardized prerequisites for other such degree programs within the SUS. If they are not, provide a rationale for a request for exception to the policy of standardized prerequisites.
- E. For bachelor's programs, if the university intends to seek formal Limited Access status for the proposed program provide a rationale which includes an analysis of diversity issues with respect to such a designation.

VI. INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY

- A. How does the proposed program specifically relate to existing institutional strengths such as programs of emphasis, other academic programs and/or institutes and centers?
- B. If there have been program reviews, accreditation visits, or internal reviews in the discipline pertinent to the proposed program, or related disciplines, provide all the recommendations and summarize the institution's progress in implementing the recommendations.
- C. Describe briefly the anticipated delivery system for the proposed program as it may relate to resources e.g., traditional delivery on main campus; traditional delivery at branches or centers; or nontraditional instruction such as instructional technology (distance learning), self-paced instruction, and external degrees. Include an analysis of the feasibility of providing all or a portion of the proposed program through distance learning technologies. Include an assessment of the institution's own technological capabilities as well as the potential for delivery of the proposed program through collaboration with other universities. Cite specific queries made of other institutions with respect to the feasibility of utilizing distance learning technologies for this degree program.
- D. Assessment of Current and Anticipated Faculty
 - 1. Use BOR Table Two to provide information about each existing faculty member who is expected to participate in the proposed program by the fifth year. If the proposal is for a graduate degree, append to the table the number of master's theses directed, number of doctoral dissertations directed, and the number and type of professional publications for each faculty member.
 - 2. Also, use BOR Table Two to indicate whether additional faculty will be needed to initiate the program, their faculty code (i.e., one of five unofficial budget classifications as explained on the table), their areas of specialization, their proposed ranks, and when they would be hired. Provide in narrative the rationale for this plan; if there is no need for additional faculty, explain.
 - 3. Use BOR Table Two to estimate each existing and

additional faculty member's workload (in percent personyears) that would be devoted to the proposed program by the fifth year of implementation, assuming that the program is approved. (Note: this total will carry over to BOR Table Three's fifth year summary of faculty positions.)

E. Assessment of Current and Anticipated Resources

1. In narrative form, assess current facilities and resources available for the proposed program in the following categories:
 - a. Library volumes (Provide the total number of volumes available in this discipline and related fields.)
 - b. Serials (Provide the total number available in this discipline and related fields, and list those major journals which are available at your institution.)
 - c. Describe classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office, and any other type of space which is necessary and currently available for the proposed program.
 - d. Equipment
 - e. Fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships (List the number and amount allocated to the academic unit in question for the past year.)
 - f. Internship sites
2. Describe additional facilities and resources required for the initiation of the proposed program (e.g., library volumes, serials, space, assistantships, specialized equipment, other expenses, OPS time, etc.). If a new capital expenditure for instructional or research space is required, indicate where this item appears on the university's capital outlay priority list. The provision of new resources will need to be reflected in the budget table, and the source of funding indicated.

VII. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON PROGRAMS CURRENTLY OFFERED

A. Budget

1. Assuming no special appropriation or BOR allocation for initiation of the program, how would resources within the institution be shifted to support the new program?
 2. Use BOR Table Three to display dollar estimates of both current and new resources for the proposed program for the first and the fifth years of the program. In narrative form, identify the source of both current and any new resources to be devoted to the proposed program.
 3. Describe what steps have been taken to obtain information regarding resources available outside the institution (businesses, industrial organizations, governmental entities, etc.). Delineate the external resources which appear to be available to support the proposed program.
- B. Describe any other projected impacts on related programs, such as prerequisites, required courses in other departments, etc.

VIII. COMMUNITY COLLEGE ARTICULATION

For undergraduate programs, describe in detail plans for articulation with area community colleges.

IX. ASSESSMENT OF APPLICABLE ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

List the accreditation agencies and learned societies which would be concerned with the proposed program. Does the institution anticipate seeking accreditation from any of these agencies? If so, indicate when accreditation will be sought. If the proposed program is at the graduate level, and a corresponding undergraduate program is already in existence, is the undergraduate program accredited? If not, why?

X. PRODUCTIVITY

Provide evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with this new degree have been productive in teaching, research, and service. Such evidence may include trends over time for average courseload, FTE productivity, student headcounts in major or service courses, degrees granted, external funding attracted; as well as qualitative indicators of excellence.

BOR TABLE ONE A**NUMBER OF ANTICIPATED MAJORS FROM POTENTIAL SOURCES*****BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

NAME OF PROGRAM:

CIP CODE:

ACADEMIC YEAR	YEAR 1		YEAR 2		YEAR 3		YEAR 4		YEAR 5	

SOURCE OF STUDENTS (Non-Duplicative Count in Any Given Year)**	YEAR 1		YEAR 2		YEAR 3		YEAR 4		YEAR 5	
	HC	FTE	HC	FTE	HC	FTE	HC	FTE	HC	FTE
Upper-level students who are transferring from other majors within the university***										
Students who initially entered the university as FTIC students and who are progressing from the lower to the upper level**										
Florida community college transfers to the upper level**										
Transfers to the upper level from other Florida colleges/universities**										
Other (Explain)**										
TOTAL										

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* List projected yearly cumulative ENROLLMENTS instead of admissions.

** Do not include individuals counted in any PRIOR category in a given COLUMN.

*** If numbers appear in this category, they should go DOWN in later years.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM BY FIFTH YEAR

Faculty CODE	Corresponding Faculty Position Category in TABLE 3 for the Fifth Year	Proposed Source of Funding for Faculty	TOTAL 5th Year Workload by Budget Classification
A	Current General Revenue	Existing Faculty – Regular Line	
B	Current General Revenue	New Faculty – To Be Hired on Existing Vacant Line	
C	New General Revenue	New Faculty – To Be Hired on a New Line	
D	Contracts & Grants	Existing Faculty – Funded on Contracts & Grants	
E	Contracts & Grants	New Faculty – To Be Hired on Contracts & Grants	
		Overall Total for 5th Year	

BOR TABLE THREE **COSTS FOR PROPOSED PROGRAM**

	FIRST YEAR				FIFTH YEAR			
	GENERAL REVENUE		CONTRACTS & GRANTS	SUMMARY	GENERAL REVENUE		CONTRACTS & GRANTS	SUMMARY
	CURRENT	NEW			CURRENT	NEW		
INSTRUCTION & RESEARCH								
POSITIONS (FTE)								
FACULTY					*	*	*	*
A&P								
USPS								
TOTAL								
SALARY RATE								
FACULTY								
A&P								
USPS								
TOTAL								
I&R								
SALARIES & BENEFITS								
OTHER PERSONNEL SERVICES								
EXPENSES								
OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY								
ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING								
LIBRARY RESOURCES								
SPECIAL CATEGORIES								
TOTAL I&R								
NON-I&R								
OTHER ACTIVITIES								
LIBRARY STAFFING								
UNIVERSITY SUPPORT								
FINANCIAL AID								
STUDENT SERVICES, OTHER								
TOTAL OTHER ACTIVITIES								
SUMMARY**								

** TOTAL I&R + TOTAL OTHER ACTIVITIES

* Should relate directly to numbers in Table 2

Appendix B

Criteria and Standards for Evaluating New Degree Proposals

**Standards for the Twenty-Five Criteria
For New Degree Authorization**

1. The proposed program is listed in the current State University System Master Plan, and the goals of the proposed program relate to the institutional mission statement as contained in the Master Plan.

- **Not Met:** Not on the SUS Strategic Plan
- **Met with Weakness:** This rating is not applicable to this criterion.
- **Met:** Program is on the SUS Strategic Plan
- **Met with Strength:** Program is on the Strategic Plan and is particularly suited to the institutional mission and areas of strength.

2. The proposed program does not duplicate other SUS offerings or, otherwise, provides an adequate rationale for doing so.

- **Not Met:**
 - The program substantially duplicates other SUS programs without a convincing rationale for doing so.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The program substantially duplicates other SUS programs, but there is a rationale for the duplication which, while not overwhelming, is convincing enough to warrant meeting the criterion.
- **Met:**
 - The proposed program will have a significantly different focus from other SUS programs in the same discipline, and / or
 - The proposed program is expected of an institution of the size and mission as the one which submitted the proposal in terms of a full complement of degree offerings, and / or
 - While there are similar SUS programs, they are in widely different geographic areas.
 - The program is not offered anywhere else in the SUS.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The program is not offered anywhere else in the SUS and at least meets criterion five.

3. There is evidence that planning for the proposed program has been a collaborative process involving academic units and offices of planning and budgeting at the institutional level, as well as external consultants, representatives of the community, etc.

- **Not Met:**
 - No evidence of collaborative planning at the institutional level is provided, and / or

- Collaborative planning at the level of the academic unit is not evident, i.e., the proposal appears to be conceptually flawed by virtue of single authorship.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - While there is evidence that planning for the proposed program has involved offices other than the academic unit from which the proposal emanates, there does not appear to have been collaborative planning with academic or institutional units which are obviously relevant.
- **Met:**
 - Evidence is provided that planning for the proposed program has been a collaborative process involving more than one relevant unit, such as academic units and offices of planning and budgeting at the institutional level. The collaboration includes any obviously relevant units (which will vary by program).
- **Met with Strength:**
 - Evidence is provided that planning for the proposed program has been a collaborative process involving all or most of the important relevant units, such as academic units and offices of planning and budgeting at the institutional level, as well collaboration with at least one of the following: external consultants, representatives of the community, representatives of the profession, or similar programs at other institutions.

4. The proposal provides a reasonable timetable of events leading to the implementation of the proposed program.

- **Not Met:**
 - No timetable of events is provided, or
 - the timetable provided is not associated in any way with the operational events referenced in the narrative of the proposal, or
 - the timetable is highly inappropriate given programmatic components or resources not in place.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The timetable of events provided is associated with some (or all) operational events referenced in the proposal, but lacks detail or proper sequencing. Examples may include
 - enrolling students into a new program before funding is secured, or before faculty/facility requirements are met;
 - providing a appropriate target date for enrolling students, but not addressing other significant events such as securing funding, hiring faculty, seeking accreditation, etc..
- **Met:**
 - The timetable of events is associated with the operational events identified in the narrative of the proposal and provides sufficient detail to determine that major requirements for implementation will be addressed in a logical sequence.

- **Met with Strength:**
 - The timetable of events is associated with the operational events identified in the narrative of the proposal and provides sufficient detail to determine that major requirements for implementation will be addressed in a logical sequence. The timetable also provides contingency plans should any major requirement (such as a new building) not be addressed within the time expected. The request is submitted well in advance of the proposed implementation date (i.e. a year or one-and-a-half years).

5. The proposal provides evidence that there is a need for more people to be educated in this program at this level.

- **Not Met:**
 - The argument for need is unaddressed in the proposal, and / or
 - The argument is completely unconvincing.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The argument for need, while present, is minimally supported or otherwise less than completely convincing.
- **Met:**
 - The proposal provides convincing evidence of need.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal provides convincing evidence of need, and there is clear knowledge from sources other than the proposal for a need for graduates of this program, and / or
 - The argument for need is compelling and highly supported within the body of the proposal with qualitative and quantitative information.

6. The proposal contains reasonable estimates of headcount and FTE students who will major in the proposed program. Actions are outlined for attempting to achieve a diverse student body.

- **Not Met:**
 - The headcount and/or FTE appear to be unrealistic. Generally, this will be the case if the proposed headcount and FTE far surpass what may reasonably be expected, judging from need and demand data, headcount in similar programs, and numbers of degrees awarded in feeder programs (if any) at the institution, or
 - Headcount and FTE are the same, except in rare cases when appropriate, or
 - In the case of bachelors programs, the headcount is far below headcounts of similar programs in the SUS, and no limited access is requested, or
 - Item 1V C in the new degree proposal format regarding diversity is not adequately addressed and/or does not contain the EO officer's signature.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The headcount and FTE, while not completely unrealistic, appear to be

- overly optimistic, judging by the same sources as in "not met" above. Or the numbers are very low and new costs are high, or
- The response to Item IV C in the proposal, regarding diversity, while including the EO officer's signature, is unconvincing.
- **Met:**
 - The headcount and FTE are realistic, judging from need and demand data, headcount in similar programs, and numbers of degrees awarded in feeder programs (if any) at the institution, and Item IV C in the proposal, regarding diversity, is adequately addressed and contains the EO officer's signature.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - It is highly likely, judging from need and demand data, headcount in similar programs, and numbers of degrees awarded in feeder programs (if any) at the institution, that the headcount and FTE projections will be met, (Extremely low numbers for programs requiring considerable new resources should not be categorized as met with strength.) and Item IV C, regarding diversity, in addition to including the EO officer's signature of the proposal, is comprehensively addressed such that there appear to be significant activities proposed to ensure diversity, and/or it appears likely that the program will have a diverse student body.

7. The proposal provides an appropriate, sequenced, and described course of study.

- **Not Met:**
 - No course information is provided, or
 - Although course information is provided, the majority of courses identified have no reasonable relationship to the degree title.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The course information is inadequate for meaningful evaluation, or
 - Planned course sequencing is inappropriate for the field of study or degree level, or
 - The program or course requirements do not meet appropriate specialized accreditation standards and/or state certification requirements, or
 - The curriculum consists of an unrealistically high number of new courses, given the number of faculty, students, and concentrations proposed.
- **Met:**
 - Courses identified have a reasonable relationship to the degree title and program purpose; planned course sequencing is appropriate for the field of study or degree level, and any appropriate specialized accreditation standards and/or state certification requirements of which staff have knowledge, are met.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - Program goals are provided; courses identified have a clear relationship

to the degree title and program goals; planned course sequencing is appropriate for the field of study or degree level, and any appropriate specialized accreditation standards and/or state certification requirements of which staff have knowledge, are met. Brief course descriptions and information that defines how courses are linked to program goals are provided; and/or a planned sequence for student matriculation is illustrated.

- An innovative curriculum, if sound, may also merit a "met with strength" designation.

8. For bachelor's programs, the total number of credit hours does not exceed 120; otherwise, the proposal provides a reasonable argument for an exception to the SUS policy of a 120 maximum. If the university intends to seek formal Limited Access status for the proposed program, the proposal provides an acceptable rationale and includes an analysis of diversity issues with respect to such a designation.

- **Not Met:**

- The program exceeds 120 hours and does not provide a reasonable argument for the exception, or
- The program requests limited access status, but no convincing rationale and/or analysis of diversity issues is provided.

- **Met with Weakness:**

- The program exceeds 120 hours and provides a marginally convincing argument for the exception, or
- The program requests limited access status with a marginally convincing rationale and /or a marginally convincing attempt to address diversity issues.

- **Met:**

- The program does not exceed 120 hours, or provides a convincing argument for the exception, or
- The program requests limited access status, and a convincing rationale is provided as well as a convincing indication that diversity issues will be addressed.

- **Met with Strength:**

- This rating is not applicable to this criterion.

9. For bachelor's programs, the proposal lists all prerequisites and provides assurance that they are the same standardized prerequisites for similar degree programs within the SUS. If they are not, the proposal provides an acceptable rationale for a request for exception to the policy of standardized prerequisites.

- **Not Met:**

- The proposal does not list prerequisites course by course or the prerequisites listed do not match the common prerequisites, and no rationale is provided for a request for exception.

- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The proposal lists prerequisites, but they do not match the common prerequisites and only a marginally convincing rationale is provided for a request for exception.
- **Met:**
 - The proposal lists the prerequisites course by course or explicitly states that there are no prerequisites; and
 - The courses listed match the common prerequisites, or
 - A convincing rationale is provided for a request for exception, or
 - The program is at the graduate level, and the criterion is not applicable.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - This rating is not applicable to this criterion.

10. The proposed program relates to specific institutional strengths such as programs of emphasis, other academic programs and/or institutes and centers.

- **Not met:**
 - The program is unrelated to any current offerings at the institution and the institution has nothing in place to build on.
- **Met with weakness:**
 - The program relates to areas which are not particularly strong at the institution, or
 - the proposal fails to mention areas of strength of which staff are aware.
- **Met:**
 - The program relates to academic programs, units and/or institutes and centers) which are noted areas of strength at the institution.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal indicates that the program relates to areas of strength in terms of academic programs as well as institutes and centers. The proposal demonstrates that discussions have taken place and the program will capitalize on these strengths, making use of resources in one or more areas of areas of excellence.

11. If there have been program reviews or accreditation activities in the discipline pertinent to the proposed program, or in related disciplines, the proposal provides evidence that progress has been made in implementing the recommendations from those reviews.

- **Not Met:**
 - The proposal provides no reference to program review or accreditation activities in the discipline or related disciplines, or
 - the proposal provides little or no evidence of progress made in implementing review recommendations and provides no rationale for the lack of progress.

- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The proposal references program review or accreditation activities in the discipline or related disciplines and provides some (but insufficient) evidence of progress made in implementing review recommendations or provides some rationale for the lack of progress. Those recommendations that have not been acted upon may have a direct impact on new program development.
- **Met:**
 - The proposal references program review or accreditation activities in the discipline or related disciplines, and provides evidence of progress made in implementing review recommendations (particularly those recommendations that would have the strongest impact on new program development) or provides a reasonable rationale for the lack of progress.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal clearly delineates review recommendations and provides evidence to indicate that significant progress has been made on each recommendation or provides a strong argument as to why the recommendation(s) have not/should not have been acted upon. Particular attention has been paid to those recommendations that would have an impact on new program development.

12. The proposal provides evidence that the institution has analyzed the feasibility of providing all or a portion of the proposed program through distance learning technologies via its own technological capabilities as well as through collaboration with other universities.

- **Not Met:**
 - No mention of distance learning technologies is provided, or
 - the proposal indicates that distance learning cannot be used without supporting analysis as to why it is not applicable, and how the university arrived at such a conclusion.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The proposal indicates that distance learning technologies can or will be used, but there is no supporting analysis or mention of specific application, or
 - the proposal indicates that distance learning cannot be used with incomplete or unsubstantiated supporting analysis.
- **Met:**
 - The proposal indicates that distance learning technologies can or will be used, and contains supporting analysis, specific applications, and examples of collaborative opportunities, or
 - the proposal indicates that distance learning cannot be used with complete and substantiated supporting analysis.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal indicates that distance learning technologies can or will be

- used, and contains supporting analysis, specific applications, detailed information on courses already available which could be incorporated into the program, examples of collaborative opportunities, and plans to develop new courses or invest in new distance learning technologies, or the program is intended to be principally offered via distance learning.

13. The proposal provides evidence that there is a critical mass of faculty available to initiate the program based on estimated enrollments.

- **Not Met:**
 - Regardless of the size of the enrollment, there are less than three headcount faculty available for the program, or
 - the number of faculty is obviously inadequate for the expected enrollment or does not meet accreditation requirements. (The acceptable ratio of faculty to students will vary by discipline and level.)
 - Faculty do not have the appropriate specializations.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The number of faculty is marginally adequate for the estimated enrollment but insufficient to provide adequate coverage and attend to scholarly activity. For example, faculty are expected to teach four mid-size to large classes (over 40) per semester at the undergraduate level.
- **Met:**
 - The number of faculty is adequate for the estimated enrollment.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - There are enough faculty to provide for reasonable class size and thesis supervision for graduate programs. Faculty will have adequate time to devote to scholarly activity in keeping with the mission of the institution and the levels at which the program is offered. The faculty in aggregate possess the various specializations appropriate for the discipline and are sufficient in number to provide dialogue among faculty with similar specializations (for example, there are two or more theoretical physicists in a department of physics offering a graduate degree).

14. For doctoral programs, the proposal provides evidence that the faculty in aggregate have the necessary experience and research activity to sustain the program.

- **Not Met:**
 - There is no evidence that even a minimal number of the faculty have experience in directing, or at least serving on, doctoral dissertation committees, and have a good record of scholarly activity, usually in the form of journal articles, including recent scholarly activity. In disciplines where it is reasonable to expect outside funding (e.g. sciences, engineering), very few or no faculty have outside funding for research. The minimal number of faculty who must meet these qualifications will

vary, depending on the number of students expected in the program. There should be enough qualified faculty to provide adequate guidance and supervision for the number of students projected.

- **Met with Weakness:**
 - There are only a minimal number of faculty who have the qualifications described in "not met" above. The scholarly activity and research funding (where appropriate) is barely adequate to sustain a research program at the doctoral level. And/or
 - the program is too heavily dependent on one faculty member who has significant research activity, while the remaining faculty have hardly any.
- **Met:**
 - The majority of faculty to be associated with the program have the qualifications relating to service on doctoral committees, publications or other scholarly activity, and research grants (where applicable).
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The majority of faculty to be associated with the program have a significant number of publications or other scholarly activity. In disciplines where research funds are available, the faculty are bringing in considerable external funding for research. Some of the faculty have national or international reputations.

15. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, there is a commitment to hire additional faculty in later years, based on estimated enrollments.

- **Not Met:**
 - The headcount and FTE projections increase considerably by the fifth year but no provisions are made to increase the faculty, and the existing faculty are clearly inadequate to meet the needs of the student headcount projected in the out years.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The proposal provides for some increase in faculty as enrollment increases but it is barely sufficient to allow time for providing adequate teaching and advising of students and scholarly activity appropriate to the mission of the university; or
 - while mention is made of possible increases in faculty, the language leads one to believe that the institution has not made a commitment to provide these faculty lines if the enrollment materializes. For example, "the program will seek additional faculty lines" "if resources are not available for additional faculty hires" or "a special legislative appropriation will be sought...."
- **Met:**
 - There is already a sufficient number of faculty to meet the projected enrollment, or the proposal provides for adequate increase in faculty as enrollment increases. There is no indication that the university has not committed to these additional hires if the enrollment materializes.

- **Met with Strength:**
 - There is already a sufficient number of faculty to meet the projected enrollment with ease, or the proposal makes ample provision for increase in faculty as enrollment increases. There will continue to be sufficient faculty to enable good coverage of teaching, advising, and scholarly activity.

16. The proposal provides evidence that library volumes and serials are sufficient to initiate the program.

- **Not Met:**
 - Program reviews, accreditation reports or other information indicates that the library resources for the existing programs in this field are weak and no provision is made in the proposal to address these concerns; or
 - the proposal identifies significant needs for additional library resources but indicates no allocation of such resources in the budget table or narrative.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The proposal's text and budget indicate that a minimal allocation will be made to address weaknesses identified in program review or accreditation activities, or within the proposal.
- **Met:**
 - There is no indication of weakness in library resources in program reviews, accreditation reports, or the proposal; or
 - adequate resources have been provided to address these concerns. The proposal provides a listing of the types of resources available or the number of volumes available
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal provides a listing of the types of library resources available. Program reviews or accreditation reports (not self-studies) indicate that library resources are an area of strength; or
 - staff have knowledge that the university's library holdings are strong in the particular discipline, and/or that there are special collections in the relevant disciplines.

17. The proposal provides evidence that classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office, and any other type of space which is necessary for the proposed program is sufficient to initiate the program.

- **Not Met:**
 - Program reviews, accreditation reports or other information indicate that the classroom, teaching lab, research lab, or office space resources for the existing programs in this field at the university are inadequate and no provision is made in the proposal to address these concerns; or

- the proposal identifies significant needs for additional space but indicates no allocation of such space in the proposal.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - A minimal attempt is made to address issues of space weakness identified in program review or accreditation activities, or within the proposal.
- **Met:**
 - There is no indication of weakness in space resources in program reviews, accreditation reports, or within the proposal; or adequate resources have been provided to address these concerns; or
 - a relevant new building is anticipated in the near future (within approximately one year), and has already been funded. (The information provided on new buildings in proposals should be verified with the facilities staff at the Board office.)
- **Met with Strength:**
 - Program reviews or accreditation reports (not self-studies) indicate that space is an area of strength; or
 - staff have knowledge that the classrooms, labs and office space are strong in the particular discipline.

18. The proposal provides evidence that necessary and sufficient equipment to initiate the program is available. (This criterion is pertinent mainly to graduate programs)

- **Not Met:**
 - Program reviews, accreditation reports, or other information indicate that the equipment for the existing programs in this field are inadequate, and no provision is made in the proposal to address these concerns; or
 - the proposal identifies significant needs for additional equipment but indicates no allocation for equipment in the proposal; or
 - the proposal is in an area which is known to have equipment needs and the proposal does not address these needs adequately.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - A minimal attempt is made to address weaknesses in the area of equipment identified in program review or accreditation reports, or within the proposal. Some funds are allocated to equipment, but they are insufficient.
- **Met:**
 - There is no indication of weakness in equipment in program reviews or accreditation reports, or within the proposal; or
 - adequate resources have been provided to address these concerns. If the proposed program is in a discipline which has equipment needs, these needs must be addressed in the proposal.
- **Met with Strength:**

- Program reviews or accreditation reports (not self-studies) in existing programs in the discipline indicate that equipment is an area of strength, and, if a doctoral program is proposed, funds are available to enhance the equipment even further; or
- staff have knowledge that equipment is an area of strength in the discipline of the proposed program; or
- the proposal identifies availability of equipment that will meet all the teaching and research needs of the program.

19. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships are sufficient to initiate the program. (This criterion is pertinent mainly to graduate programs.)

- **Not Met:**
 - The program is a graduate program in which fellowships, scholarships or assistantships are the norm, and none or an obviously inadequate number are indicated in the proposals. (For example, a Ph.D. in chemistry, with expected enrollments of 15-25, with only two assistantships.) Or
 - the amount of the stipend is so low as to be non-competitive in attracting students in that discipline.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The program is a graduate program in which fellowships, scholarships or assistantships are the norm, and a marginal number of such forms of aid are proposed.
- **Met:**
 - The program is one in which fellowships, scholarships and assistantships are not expected, either because it is a bachelor's program or it is a professional graduate program which may be populated by students who are working in the field or the expected salaries after graduation are sufficiently great to make the student responsibility for the total cost of education a reasonable assumption (e.g. an MBA or professional engineering program); or
 - the program provides a reasonable number of fellowships, scholarships or assistantships.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The program is one in which fellowships, scholarships or assistantships are the norm, and the program has sufficient resources to offer an adequate number of competitive packages of such aid as to be nationally competitive.

20. The proposal provides evidence that, if appropriate, clinical and internship sites have been arranged.

- **Not Met:**
 - No clinical or internship sites have been arranged, and the discipline is

one in which such experiences are expected.

- **Met with weakness:**
 - There is indication that conversations regarding clinical and internship sites have taken place but no commitments have been made.
- **Met:**
 - Clinical and internship sites have been arranged, and the sites have made commitments to accept the students; or
 - The discipline is one in which clinical or internships are not applicable.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - Clinical and internship sites have been arranged, evidence of commitments are provided, and the commitments are adequate in number and appropriate variety to satisfy the program's needs.

21. The proposal provides evidence that, in the event that resources within the institution are redirected to support the new program, such a redirection will not have a negative impact on undergraduate education.

- **Not Met:**
 - No argument is presented, and / or;
 - The argument is unconvincing, and / or;
 - It is clear from the stated intentions of the proposal that there will be redirection that has an adverse effect on undergraduate education.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The argument that redirection will not have an adverse effect on undergraduate education, while present, is minimally supported or otherwise less than completely convincing.
- **Met:**
 - The program will not result in any fiscal redirection, and / or;
 - Resources will be redirected to support the new program, but the proposal provides a sound argument that the redirection will not have an adverse effect.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - The proposal provides a particularly strong and thoughtful response and plan to ensure that redirection will not have an adverse effect.

22. The proposal provides a complete and reasonable budget for the program which reflects the text of the proposal. Costs for the program reflect costs associated with similar programs at other SUS institutions.

- **Not Met:**
 - The budget tables in the proposal have major inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies with the narrative and other tables; or
 - the costs reflected in the proposal do not account for all the basic needs of the program.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - There are minor technical inaccuracies in the budget table, and/or minor inconsistencies with the narrative and other tables; or
 - the costs are marginally adequate for a program of this type.
- **Met:**
 - The budget table is accurate, consistent with the rest of the proposal, and adequate to meet the needs of the program of this type.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - In addition to being accurate and consistent, the budget provides ample resources for the program. It is a particular strength if the budget reflects considerable external funding already coming into the department which will support the program.

23. For an undergraduate program, the proposal provides evidence that community college articulation has been addressed and ensured.

- **Not Met:**
 - The proposal describes admissions procedures which are inherently unfair to community college transfers and/or places them at a disadvantage in relation to FTICs.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - There appears to be equitable treatment of community college students, but additional information is needed for clarity.
- **Met:**
 - The proposal provides for community college articulation and the equitable treatment of transfer students in regard to admission into the program. Relevant criterion #9 has been met.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - Not only will the community college transfers be treated equitably and provision for articulation identified, but, in addition, the proposal outlines overtures made to community colleges to inform students of the program and to ensure adequate preparation in terms of the common prerequisites. The program will actively recruit community college students.

24. The proposal contains evidence that, if appropriate, the institution anticipates seeking accreditation for the proposed program.

- **Not Met:**
 - Board staff have knowledge that or there is an indication that accreditation is appropriate for the proposed program, but the proposal either does not mention pursuit of accreditation or indicates that there is no intention to seek accreditation without providing sufficient argument for such a decision.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - There is an indication that accreditation is appropriate for the proposed program, but the proposal provides little information about a timeline for seeking accreditation and/or insufficient evidence that the program has been planned with accreditation standards in mind, or accreditation is not applicable.
- **Met:**
 - There is an indication that accreditation is appropriate for the proposed program, and the proposal provides information about a timeline for seeking accreditation and some evidence that the program has been planned with accreditation standards in mind.
- **Met with Strength:**
 - There is an indication that accreditation is appropriate for the proposed program, and the proposal provides a specific timeline for seeking accreditation and solid evidence that the program has been planned with significant attention to accreditation standards.

25. The proposal provides evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with this new degree have been productive in teaching, research, and service.

- **Not Met:**
 - The academic units associated with the program have very low headcount or degrees granted. For an existing baccalaureate program, degrees granted during a three year period is less than a total of 15; for an existing master's program, the three year total is less than 10. There may be a few disciplines in which such low numbers are acceptable, but these will be exceptional cases. If the proposed program is at the graduate level and the proposal does not provide evidence that the faculty have engaged in scholarly activity at a reasonable level, this criterion also would be considered unmet. There is no evidence of service activity.
- **Met with Weakness:**
 - The headcount, degrees produced, scholarly activity, and service activity is marginal or declining; or
 - the proposal provides marginal evidence of teaching, research, and service productivity.
- **Met:**
 - The headcount, degrees produced, scholarly activity, and service activity

is at a level expected in the discipline for the degree programs currently offered in the unit, and either stable or increasing.

- **Met with Strength:**

- The headcount, degrees produced, scholarly activity, and service activity is high and either stable or increasing. In disciplines with expectations of external funding, the unit has garnered significant amounts of external funds. The proposal presents an outstanding discussion of teaching, research and service activities.

Appendix C

Sample Chart of Ratings on 25 Criteria

Summary of New Degree
Program Criteria Evaluations
February 2000

Key

- ↑ Met with strength
● Met
↓ Met with weakness
☒ Not Met

#	University	Proposed Program	1. On Strategic Plan	2. Program Duplication	3. Planning Process	4. Appropriate Timetable	5. Needs Assessment	6. Headcount/FTE Estimates	7. Appropriate Course of Study	8. Appropriate Credit Hours (UG)	9. Common Prerequisites (UG)	10. Institutional Strengths	11. Recent Program Review Follow-up	12. Exploration of Distance Learning	13. Faculty Availability	14. Faculty Experience	15. Commitment to Hire New Faculty	16. Library Resources	17. Facilities	18. Equipment	19. Scholarships, Assistantships, etc.	20. Clinical & Internship Sites Identified	21. Impact of Institutional Resource Shifting	22. Budget	23. Community College Articulation	24. Accreditation	25. Faculty Productivity	Recommendation
	A		●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	B		●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	C		●	●	↓	●	↑	↑	●	●	●	●	↑	↑	●	↑	↑	●	●	●	●	●	↑	●	●	●	↑	Implementation
	D		↑	●	●	●	↑	●	↑	●	●	●	↓	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	E		●	●	↑	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	↓	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	F		●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	G		●	●	●	↓	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	↑	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	H		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Implementation
	I		↑	●	●	↓	●	↓	●	●	●	●	☒	●	↓	●	↓	●	↓	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Planning
	J		↑	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	↑	●	●	☒	●	●	↓	●	↓	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	↑	Planning
	K		●	●	●	↓	●	●	●	↓	☒	●	●	☒	●	↓	☒	↓	☒	↓	●	☒	↓	↓	↓	↓	●	No Action
	L		●	●	↓	☒	↓	●	●	☒	↓	●	↓	↓	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	No Action
	M		●	●	●	●	●	☒	●	☒	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	☒	↓	●	☒	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	●	No Action
	N		●	↓	↑	↓	↓	☒	↓	●	●	↑	↓	☒	☒	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	●	☒	●	●	☒	☒	●	No Action
	O		●	☒	↓	●	↓	●	↓	●	●	↓	☒	☒	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↓	●	●	☒	●	●	↓	●	No Action
	P		↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	●	●	●	↓	↓	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	☒	☒	●	↓	●	●	No Action
	Q		↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	●	●	●	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	●	No Action
	R		●	☒	●	↓	↓	☒	●	●	●	↑	●	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	☒	↓	↓	●	☒	●	●	●	●	No Action

● Dark box indicates a criterion which has improved subsequent to Planning Approval at the July 1999 BOR Meeting

BEST COPY AVAILABLE